## Remarks

Claims 1-7 are active in the application. Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by a U.S. Patent to Kriesel, no. 6,063,059. Claims 1-6 stand further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by a U.S. Patent to Moberg, no. 6,248,093.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the language of element "c." This alternative wording choice makes clear and unambiguous the requirement that the plunger rod threads and drive screw threads interlock (and disengage) as the barrel is turned. The scope of the claim remains unchanged and thus no new matter has been added.

## **Interview Summary**

Applicants appreciate the opportunity for the interview held between Applicants' attorney John Conway and examiner Matthew Desanto on October 16, 2003.

The Kriesel reference was discussed and it was agreed that this reference does not teach at least some of the limitations of claim 1 of the subject application. In particular, Kriesel's plunger rod (reference number 170 in fig. 23) is without threads and, thus, does not engage with the drive screw threads (reference number 174 in fig. 23) at all. Kriesel therefore does not teach element "c" of claim 1.

The Moberg reference was also discussed. Attorney Conway pointed out that the plunger rod screw threads (identified in the office action as 905, 902 in fig. 9 of the Moberg reference) were not removably engageable with the threads

of the drive screw (901 in fig. 9) at all. Examiner Desanto stated that further study of the Moberg reference would be required to determine the validity of that statement and that clarification of the "removably engageable" language in the claim may be useful. No agreement was reached on the rejections over the Moberg reference.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by a U.S. Patent to Moberg. Claim 1 is patentable over Moberg because Moberg does not teach a barrel which when rotated interlocks the plunger rod threads with the drive screw threads. In particular, referring to fig. 4 of Moberg, rotation of reservoir 406 (denoted as a "barrel" in ¶3 of the office action) does not remove rod 905 from engagement with screw threads 901.

Claim 1, as amended, requires, in part:

c. a plunger rod, the rod having threads at least part of its length, the rod inserted through the clearance hole, the rod threads interlocking with and disengaging from the screw threads by rotating the barrel about the barrel axis.

Since Moberg does not teach a required limitation of element "c" of claim 1, as amended, Moberg cannot anticipate claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Moberg. Claims 2-5 which depend from claim 1 and add further limitations are patentable over Moberg for at least the same reasons as for claim 1. The office action does not state how the Moberg reference anticipates claim 6. Claim 6 requires a plunger rod whose threads

are capable of engagement with a drive screw having exterior threads and an axis displaced from, and parallel to, the reservoir axis. Moberg does not teach or suggest a plunger rod meeting these limitations. Thus, claims 1-6 are deemed patentable over Moberg.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by a U.S. Patent to Kriesel. As described above in the interview summary, claims 1-7 are patentable over Kriesel because Kriesel does not teach a required limitation of claim 1: that the plunger rod threads interlock with and disengage from the drive screw threads when the barrel is rotated.

Claims 2-5 and 7, which depend from claim 1 and add further limitations, are patentable over Kriesel for at least the same reasons as for claim 1. The office action does not address how Kriesel reads on claim 6. Kriesel's plunger rod has no threads and therefore cannot anticipate claim 6 which requires a plunger rod with threads. Therefore, claims 1-7 are patentable over Kriesel.

Applicants request reconsideration of all pending claims and a notice of allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 19-4972. The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if any matters remain outstanding so that they may be resolved expeditiously.

Respectfully submitted,

John L. Conway Registration No. 48,241 Attorney for Applicants

Bromberg & Sunstein LLP 125 Summer Street Boston, MA 02110-1618 (617) 443-9292

01062/00C54 274864